DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 521 SO 008 731

AUTHOR Diem, Richard A.
TITLE Conflict and Conflict Resolution: Teacher Education to Improve the Teaching Environment.
PUB DATE 26 Nov 75
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Atlanta, Georgia, November 26-29, 1975)
AVAILABLE FROM Richard A. Diem, Division of Education, University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, Texas 78285 ($4.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Authoritarianism; *Behavior Problems; Classroom Environment; *Conflict; *Conflict Resolution; Parent Role; Research Projects; Secondary Education; Socially Deviant Behavior; Student Teachers; *Teacher Education; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

The general purposes of this study were to determine what consitutes conflict situations in a suburban high school and how these situations are viewed by parents, teachers, and students. The high school used in this study was one of four high schools within a large school district located in the northwest corner of Cook County, Illinois. The research study consisted of nonparticipant behavior observations and administration of statistical instruments. The questionnaires consisted of identifying information (the independent variables) and posing questions about conflict, conflict situations, and conflict-solving mechanisms (the dependent variables). The major conclusions drawn from both the behavior observation and the questionnaires were that conflict was caused by four distinctive types of behavior: cutting classes, using drugs, smoking cigarettes, and drinking alcoholic beverages. Teachers and parents accepted the authoritarian role given them. However, it was found that some parents would not use this role in certain situations, yet they expected the school to enforce the rules against these behaviors and sought stringent rules against them. The author suggests that efforts to understand and deal with conflict must take place when teachers are preparing for their new roles. (Author/JR)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED115521

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION: TEACHER EDUCATION TO IMPROVE THE TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

Dr. Richard A. Diem
Assistant Professor of Education
The University of Texas at San Antonio

SO 008 231

A Paper Presented to
The National Council of Social Studies
College and University Faculty Assembly

at the NCSS Annual Meeting

November 26, 1975
Atlanta, Georgia

## CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION: TEACHER EDUCATION TO IMPROVE THE TEACHING ENVIRONMENT

The days of strict authoritarian control over students in schools are largely a matter of history. The present acceptance of individualism has broken the notion of every student fitting a mold. The decisions of courts have re-defined the rights of students. The loosening of parent-student supervision has shifted more opportunities for decision-making onto students. The preoccuption by the media with deliquency, bohemianism, and radicalism has invested these adolescent alternatives with wider publicity and more virtue than they necessarily have had in the past. The sheer size of school populations has increased anonymity and a sense of detachment from the school as a community. The ideas and values of teachers and administrators have shifted as the secondary school moved from preparation for college to a range of types of pre-professional, pre-academic, and pre-vocational courses. State laws requiring attendance until the age of sixteen prevents those who see little value in schooling from leaving the school.

The effect of these forces and influences is the enforced enrollment of an entire age group in an institution that for a large number may not satisfy any of their expectations or aspirations. Given that this institution was created to

serve an intellectual and or monied elite, and that institutions are notoriously slow to adapt to changing conditions or to accommodate differing values, it is no wonder that conflict occurs within schools or that the resolution of conflict occupies a high portion of the time of some school personnel. The wonder is that there is not more conflict and even less satisfaction with the nature of conflict resolution.

Throughout the entire teacher education process, the perspective student-teacher has not had to deal with these types of problems. For the most part, this individual is more concerned with dealing with his own institution and the conflicts within it. He has no notion of what school conflicts are nor how they are dealt with.

## General Purpose of the Study

The general purposes of this study were to determine what constituted conflict situations in a surburban high school and how these situations were viewed by parents, teachers and students. These questions arose as a result of contact, observation, and interaction with parents, teachers, student teachers, and students. Through these contacts it was noted that there were significant differences among these groups in dealing with conflict situations.

## The Nature of Conflict

The common sense notion of conflict is the active opposition of persons over something. Conflict has a cause, an interaction, and a resolution.

Cause is seen when two men on the subway want the same seat--the last empty seat. Two women want to celebrate their mother's birthday--but they want it celebrated at different times, different places, and in different ways. A husband and wife have one income to spend--but they have two different budgets.

Interaction occurs when the two men sprint for the seat, the two women arrange two parties, and the husband and wife each spend more than their total income. Resolution takes place when one man sits down and the other turns away, when the mother leaves for Florida before her birthday, and when the husband and wife end up in divorce court.

Careful observation reveals even more. Conflict is a universal phenomenon. It can occur within a person's mind; it can occur between a person and nature; it can occur between or among individuals, between or among an individual and groups, or between or among groups. There can be behind-the-scene actors, secretly playing significant roles.

Each participant does have goals. These may be material and concrete, and thus easily observed. These goals may be psychological and valuational, and thus easily hidden and subject to identification only by inference. In the course of interacting, the original goals may be replaced by secondary, often more emotional goals. The motives lying behind the goals are often quite different--one man is genuinely tired

and needs the rest, the other man doesn't want a younger, bearded man to sit while he stands.

The resolution of conflict may be genuine, pacifying, or unsatisfactory. Genuine resolution brings with it a sense that both sides won, that both goals were achieved, and that all participants were party to a mature, rational or satisfying solution. The pacification of conflict occurs when someone gives in to a law or principal that he did not know existed, when someone decides the calculated cost of escalating the conflict is not worth the risk of losing, or when both sides are so tired of the issue that they are pleased when no one seems willing to pursue the matter further. Unsatisfactory resolution occurs when one side loses and one side wins, when the loser feels he or she has been treated as an object rather than as human, and when the winner takes delight in announcing (often repeatedly) that the other person is a loser. In the case of genuine or pacifying resolution, the conflict truly ends and has no unfortunate effects. In the case of unsatisfactory resolution, the effects are sometimes persistent and harmful. The loser may seek revenge on the original "other" party or on some substitute, or may suffer loss of self-respect, or may develop a more negative attitude toward rules, norms, and institutions involved somehow in the conflict situation.

Conflict occurs in all societies, and eventually, within

all groups making up a society. In response, a society (or its sub-groups) creates laws, rules, norms, and customs to control conflict. In many instances these means do prevent or control conflict. In some instances they are all that prevents a person or group from becoming so desperate over perceived inequities that overt violence is the only remedy for losing a conflict.

The school is a social institution, legitimatized by the state and created by the local community. The school has certain assigned functions (and some functions that evolve from circumstances and tradition). The school has a body of rules reflecting the laws of the state and the norms of the community. These rules are intended to facilitate the conduct of schooling. The school also promotes a secondary layer of rules derived from pragmatic solutions to persistent problems, from the personal preferences of teachers, administrators, and members of the school board, and from norms of the community influencing behavior that may or may not be related to learning or to schooling.

For example, the state requires regular attendance of students on the basis that attendance is a necessary condition for learning. On the other hand, an administrator (with considerable community backing) may rule against long hair on male students. In the first case, there may be general agreement among students, parents, teachers, and administrators about the value of the rule. In the second case, different persons

from each of the groups involved may put quite different values on the same rule or on a set of different rules.

In most instances of interpersonal conflict within the setting of a school, the basis of conflict is a violation of a school rule. A student, for reasons of his or her own, violates a rule. A teacher observes the violation and reports the student, usually to a person with the power to punish the transgressor. Depending on the seriousness of the violation, the conflict over rules is a matter between the student and the counselor charged with maintaining discipline, or among the student, the counselor, and the parent. For example, cutting a class is between the student and the counselor unless the cutting persists; then the parent is called in for a conference. On the other hand, a single incident of using drugs calls for the immediate presence of the parent.

Conflict is a process; it begins with a rule, involves an observed violation of a rule, leads to a report on the violation, and culminates in a conference. Within this conference the conflict may take the form of one or more of three general issues. Was there an actual violation of a rule, and sometimes whether or not the rule is unreasonable or fair? What would be an appropriate resolution of the violation? To what extent is each party satisfied with the formal resolution of the conflict?

A school conflict, then, is an interaction involving two

or more people in pursuit of some goal and differing over the importance of some rule. The elements of the conflict situation are (1) a rule exists; (2) a student violates the rule; (3) the violation is observed and reported; (4) the parent is called to school for a conference; and (5) conflict occurs over the actuality of violation, the appropriateness of resolution; or the extent of satisfaction with the resolution.

Parents, teachers, and students all play roles in this study, as they do in the conflict situations involving the school. Despite the fact that students and teachers have more direct interaction and conflict in school, the role of the parent cannot be overlooked in conflict situations. Students enter high school with values formed by their own experiences and by those of their parents.

Initially, questions about conflict arose as a result of the author's experience as a social studies teacher in a suburban high school. Through contact with students and observation of other teachers' interactions with them, significant differences among teachers and students in dealing with conflict situations became obvious. Despite the rules and regulations regarding areas where clashes of ideas took place, individual reactions overlooked what was supposed to happen "within the discipline guidelines." Additionally, it became increasingly evident that parents and teachers viewed school policy about conflict situations differently.

In order to see if these casual observations had validity, some type of systematic observation of conflict had to take place. Observation of conferences where contrasting ideas about the resolution of conflict taking place would confirm or reject these notions. To confirm the reliability of these observations a questionnaire would be used to see if a larger sample of the school community reacted to conflict as the observed population did.

The Site

The high school used in this study, one of four high schools within a large school district, is located in the northwest corner of Cook County, Illinois. The high school attendance area encompasses portions of four cities and some unincorporated areas of the county. For purposes of confidentiality, the school used in this study will be called Northside High School. All personal names for students, parents, and members of the staff at Northside High School are fictitious.

The population of Northside High School is composed of families representing wide ranges of socio-economic status, levels of education attained, occupation, and age. Students from a state-financed home also attend Northside; many of these students come fron the inner city of Chicago and other areas of Cook County.

Conducting Research in the School

Once granted approval to begin research at Northside,

information was gathered through non-participant behavior observation, both in individual and in group counseling sessions, and by the administration of a questionnaire to students, parents, and teachers.

Observation in Individual Sessions

In the course of this study, non-participant behavior observations were made in 35 individual counseling sessions. Non-participant behavior observation consisted of watching two or more members of a conflict situation stating and then attempting to resolve the causes of the conflict. While observing, no notes were taken, no verbal communication took place (except between the parties involved in the counseling situation), and no questions were asked or answered by the researcher. After the individual observations were completed, notes were compiled listing:

1. The nature of the conflict situation
2. The individual subjects involved in the observation
3. The remedy or resolution of the situation

These sessions took place in the office of the Dean of Boys or Dean of Girls. These counseling sessions generally took place in the mid-afternoon, as a convenience to the parents and teachers involved. The sessions lasted from 45 minutes to one hour in length.

The subjects involved in these observations were students involved in disciplinary procedures being administered

by the deans; students involved in conflict counseling sessions; parents of students needing disciplinary action; teachers called in to discuss conflict situations; counselors and social workers who were in the role of "problem solvers"; and deans who administered the rules of Northside High School.

It became obvious during the course of the observations that it was impossible to observe everything that took place during the counseling sessions. Both verbal and non-verbal messages were interchanged in a variety of ways. An observer can follow only one message at a time and may well miss other interactions taking place. The necessity of recording the major content further restricted the observer's ability to record simultaneous interactions.

All members of these sessions - parents, teachers, and students, gave their permission to be observed before the sessions began. Any questions as to why the observations were taking place, or how they would be used, were answered before the observations began.

The individual non-participant observation sessions took place over a six month period from December, 1973, to May, 1974.

Observation in Group Session

While the individual non-participant observations were taking place, the counseling staff and social worker invited me to sit in on a group counseling session held at night. This session consisted of from 9 to 15 parents, brought together

to discuss problems common to all of them, and led by a male counselor and a female social worker.

The topics chosen for discussion were left to the group to decide. At the close of a session, a series of topics for the following week were suggested and then voted upon for an agenda. If a specific area of concern to one of the group members arose, either during the week or on the night of the session, the agenda would be amended to acommodate the personalities concerned.

After sitting in on one session, I asked the group if I could observe them for the remainder of the school year. They agreed I could observe. The first observation took place in January, 1974 and the last one was held in May, 1974. Twelve group observations were made.

The same procedures used in the individual observations were used in the group observations. While observing the group, there was no participation in any of the discussions, no comments were made, and no notes were taken.

General Observations.

Being a member of the faculty allowed me to observe the school as an insider. There was no need to gain acceptance or to request permission from the teachers or administration each time that I wanted to observe particular conflict situations.

My presence at counseling sessions went unquestioned and mostly unnoticed. There was little hesitation on the part of the parents, students, or teachers to allow me to watch them, either in formal observation session, or in informal rap ses-

sions.

This may seem an unfair advantage in doing research, but it has its drawbacks as well. Self-made and self-imposed prejudices become part of all of us, and these are not overcome by doing research. Earlier personality clashes with faculty, as well as with students, limited some observations from taking place.

Administration of the Statistical Instrument.

The instruments used in this study were questionnaires given to the teachers, students, and parents of Northside High School in September and October of 1974. The instrument consisted of 31 questions on the student questionnaire, and 27 questions on the parent and teacher questionnaires. The first part of each of the questionnaires consisted of identifying information (the independent variables). The second part of the questionnaires posed questions about conflict, conflict situations, and conflict solving mechanisms (the dependent variables). The only difference between the student and parent-teacher questionnaires was a section included in the student questionnaire asking about family status (i.e., who do you live with, are your parents deceased).

The teachers answered their questionnaires on the first day of school in September, 1974. They were not required to complete the questionnaires, nor were they required to return them to me. At a general faculty meeting, time was allotted to give those who wished to do so the opportunity to answer the questionnaires.

Questionnaires were returned by 103 faculty members, for a rate of 94 per cent. This total includes administrative personnel such as the principal, and deans as well as teachers.

The students completed the questionnaires three days later. For the sake of expediency, the social science department at Northside High School administered the instrument to students.

The social science department of Northside High School consists of seven full-time teachers and a department chairman who divides his time between teaching and administrative duties. The curriculum of Northside calls for a minimum of one and one half years of social sciences as a graduation requirement, so every student must come in contact with this department in order to complete their graduation requirements.

Each teacher in the department participated in administering the instrument. The author told the teachers the purposes of the project, gave them instructions for administering the questionnaires, and answered any questions they had about the instrument. On the first day of classes the teachers gave the students 20 minutes to complete the questionnaires.

The school district sets the standards regarding the number of students in each class. The minimum number of students for a class is 20; the maximum number is 39. This is true for all classes except those designated as "low ability" classes where the naximum number of students is 25. Because of these

standards, at least two separate classes at each grade level participated in completing the instrument. This was done so that at least 50 students from each grade level took part in the experimental design. Two hundred and thirty-one students completed the questionnaire; 49 ninth graders, 51 tenth graders, 63 eleventh graders, and 68 twelfth graders. Questionnaires were returned by all the students. There were some unanswered questions on many of the instruments and this was taken into account during later statistical analysis.

An explanatory letter, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to the parents of those students who completed the questionnaires. Out of the 205 questionnaires mailed to the parents, 149 were returned, for a rate of 73 per cent.

The responses to all of the questionnaires were coded and punched onto keypunch cards, numbered to correspond to each questionnaire. The data were then treated by chi-square analysis with the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.

Using a chi-square analysis of comparing the respondents answers, the statistical importance of the answers can be determined. If the significance were .05 or less, then the probability of these answers occurring by chance is less than five in 100. The .05 level of confidence was used to accept or reject the null hypotheses.

The region of rejection for each null hypothesis consists

of all values of chi-square that are so large that the probability of their occurrence under a null hypothesis is equal to or less than a .05 level of confidence.

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn directly from observation or analysis of the questionnaire responses were as follows:

Conflict was caused by four distinctive types of behavior: cutting classes, using drugs, smoking cigarettes; and drinking alcoholic beverages.

Students did not accept any of these types of behavior. Likewise, they would not report their fellow students for any of these behaviors. Additionally, students would cut, would smoke, and would admit to knowing of drug usage and drinking at a higher proportion than either their parents or their teachers.

Those students most vulnerable to conflict were the younger (14-16 year olds) students. These are the students that indicate that they will cut class, use drugs, and find these and other types of conflict behavior acceptable at a higher proportion than the rest of the student group. This may be the result of a pre-drop-out syndrome. But it may also indicate that this age group is the most susceptible to conflict. This is the break away point in many lives. Decisions

about jobs, post secondary schooling, and life goals begin to demand attention. Many adolescents cannot cope with these pressures, so they opt out, hoping to prolong the inevitability of adulthood.

This is also a period when the search for excitement and adventure also come to the fore. Breaking rules is seen as flirting with danger. The kicks come from shocking parents and teachers. It is more a matter of creating a hazard than enduring one.

Finally, this is a period of group thinking. Strong alliances are formed and loyalty becomes a dominant emotion. In the face of outside threats (parents and teachers) the group (students) joins ranks against them.

Youth are a minority group and occupy marginal status. They are not ignored, but they are not taken wholly seriously. Their status is dependent on adults and adult roles. This is where conflict ensues.

Teachers accepted the authoritarian role given them. They enforced all school rules. They did this even though they sometimes totally opposed these rules. Some teachers attempted to circumvent these rules by avoiding them for a time, but eventually fell back on them and used them when they felt it to be necessary.

Most teachers were content when rules were enforced. Little in the way of understanding why students cut, smoked,

drank, or used drugs, was manifested in the teachers actions. As long as no trouble occurred in their classroom, everything was fine.

Parents also accepted the idea of being an authoritarian figure. However, they would not use this role in certain key situations. Parents would not report a youngster for cutting classes, using drugs, smoking or drinking. Yet they expected the school to enforce the rules against these behaviors and sought stringent rules against them. However, parents equated discipline and conflict with disfavor, hence they avoided both. Parents sought children out as friends and pals. Disciplinary control had been turned over to the school. Parents felt that, "It's the responsibility of the school to control my child." How could the school provide control of conflict situations when there was not strong parental cooperation?

This disassociation on the part of parents was unfortunate because of their apparent ignorance of school conflict situations. Parents did not know of students drinking or using drugs in school. Further, they appeared fearful of even speculating on whether or not they would report children for drinking or using drugs if the evidence presented itself.

Discussion about conflict occurred only after the conflict had taken place. No one knew that a student used drugs until he was caught. A student who cut a class was counseled after he cut two or three times. There were no

means to prevent conflict. Out of this type of behavior came a breakdown of communication between the groups when a conflict situation occurred. Students felt that they could not get a fair shake, teachers reported students for breaking rules because they had to, and parents began to disassociate themselves with their children when their children needed help most.

Other conclusions were inferred from relationships between observations and analysis of data. These conclusions fall into the two general areas of roles and conflict, and satisfaction with the natures of the resolution of conflict.

The roles that these groups assumed were a direct cause of conflict. These subjects were in a constant struggle for supremacy over the school domain. The students knew that they could not win this battle but continued with it because their student role demanded that they constantly nudge and shove at the rules. The rules might be good ones, but because of the adolescent's need to test all behavior modes, constant pressure was put upon parents and teachers to enforce the rules.

Conflict and Roles. Membership in a group implies a set of behaviors and attitudes, on the part of members consistent with a set of expectations shared by members of that group. These expectations apply to every member of the group, although those in positions of leadership or power may exhibit some eccentricities. Members both form and conform to the norms expected by the group. Individual behavior is considered appropriate when it is in accord with these norms and the

individual is rewarded by the security of membership. Violation of a norm leads to some relatively mild sanction, but persistent violation or truly deviant behavior leads to expulsion or isolation.

The three groups under observation in this study were students, teachers (usually a special sub-group called counselors), and parents. Consequently, any conflict involved some playing out of roles expected by the memberships of the three groups. The students and teachers were subject both to the expectations of their own groups and the expectations of the other groups. That is to say, the students not only had to play a role consistent with the expectations of fellow students but also was the subject to the expectations of student and teacher, but not necessarily to expectations of a larger interested group of parents.

Parents and students were also caught in the expectations parents hold for their children and those a son or daughter holds for his or her parents. A school dispute brings out the latent conflict between loyalties to different groups and thus often calls for parent or student to shift back and forth between roles. Contradictory expectations based on role and group differences held by an individual were a constant source of conflict, particularly when the parent shifted full responsibility for discipline of a student to teachers. In such instances, the parent was no help in resolving conflict, and

further, by rejecting responsibility for resolving conflict and the nature of the resolution. Under present counseling practices this parental attitude ensures dissatisfaction on the part of both student and teacher with the resolution of the conflict. The disengaged parent literally ensures a no-win situation. Unless the student and parent subsequently find some means of avoiding or resolving further conflicts, everyone suffers until the student drops out of school.

A variation on the disengaged parent is the uninvolved parent--the one who will not come to the school for a conference no matter how many requests are made. The basis for this situation is literally beyond relief by the school. The parent does not care for the youngster, or had given up being a parent, or cannot afford to attend a conference during school hours. The true victim is the student, but teachers also suffer, for in these circumstances they often give extra time and thought to the situation, and often give special consideration to the student. The results vary; if the student gets the nurturance he or she desires from a teacher, then violations of rules may decrease and the student may attempt to stay in school; if there is no psychological attraction between student and teacher, then violations continue until the student can drop out of school.

Teachers have fewer role conflicts than parents or students. The role of the teacher (as a counselor responsible

for discipline) is fairly clearly defined, with reasonable agreement among the expectations of the three groups. There are two variations in definition, however, that tended to escalate conflict. The first was the sudden realization on the part of a parent that he or she no longer had complete jurisdiction over their children. This realization, that a teacher has some power over personal behavior not directly concerned with content or method tended to generate some conflict between teacher and parent over whether a rule was reasonable or whether a punishment was appropriate. The second variation was the natural antagonism between those with power and those without it. The students knew these rules, knew there were sanctions for breaking a rule, and knew someone had the power to apply one of those sanctions. Interestingly enough the students who saw a teacher as being fair (meaning consistent) did not seem to resent the teacher's power. It was in those cases where a student did not know what to expect from the teacher that the power to decide among punishments was resented and where the student was apt to escalate conflict by reacting to terms a teacher used as being insulting, to explanations as being patronizing, or to punishments as being vindictive.

On the part of students the greatest difficulty in resolving roles was between what students expect of students and what teachers expect of students. If a group of friends

cut a class, the student faced a dilemma. He (or she) wanted to be with his friends, indeed, he was expected to go along with them. He (or she) also did not necessarily want trouble with the teacher. There would be some trouble no matter what the student did. No one knows how many students rejected the overtures of friends and went to class; no one knows how many cuts went unobserved or unreported. What is known is that students do cut, teachers do report cuts, but unless the rate of cutting becomes persistent, no one gets too upset.

What appeared in the conferences and the questionnaires was the age-old basis for conflict centered on inter-generational differences over the importance of violations or the tolerance for violations. This was seen most clearly in the cases of drinking or using drugs. Even when most students disapproved of these behaviors in school, the same students reported no circumstances under which they would report violators. It was as if the informal rules between the generations were that unless adults could catch the student, the student was home free. This attitude of students seems particularly distressing to adults, but is it so different from the lack of involvement of adults in conflicts between other adults? Adults ignore calls for help, evasions of laws, and even violent crimes on the grounds that they do not want to become involved. Neither student nor adult may be right on ethical grounds, but the attitude of students on involvement seems

no more than a reflection of the attitudes of adults toward involvement. What is important is that under present circumstances teachers (as adults) can expect no help from students (as adolescents) in the enforcement of rules that lead to conflict situations.

These conflict situations had one major characteristic in this school setting. They dealt with violations that either could not be resolved at some earlier point (cutting or smoking), or with violations where a single detected incidence was considered serious (drinking or dope). Of the 25 observed conferences on cutting or smoking, ten seemed to be resolved satisfactorily and fifteen had no positive effect on future violations. Of the latter, three ended only when the student dropped out of school. Given these results, it seemed fair to conclude that the conferences and methods used to resolve these problems were not satisfactory and did not prevent conflict, and, indeed, may have encouraged it.

Of the eight observed conferences on drinking or drugs, three seemed to be resolved satisfactorily and five had no effect on future violations. It is clear that these conferences came too late to do any good for the student. A means of prevention was needed, not an after the fact discussion.

In turn, analysis of the questionnaire responses indicate that students will tolerate the types of behavior that cause conflict. They will not report their fellow students, even if they are sick, or causing harm.

Parents say school rules should be enforced, but will not report children for breaking them. Parents do not accept any of the types of behavior that cause conflict.

Teachers will enforce all school rules. They will do this even if they do not agree with the rule. Teachers are placed in an untenable bind between what they want to do and what they have to do. These constraints and demands are placed on teachers by parents, school administrators and by their own personalities.

The second that a person assumes the role of teacher, the possibility of conflict with students becomes automatic. By the very nature of the authoritarian role he assumes, the teacher tends to defend the sources of his authority. He must protect the school rules and his position in the school against any type of assault.

Likewise, children also assume role characteristics the minute the school bell rings. They are no longer kids, they are now students. Certain social and personal characteristics encompass them. These attributes that students assume come into direct variance with their parents and teachers notions of how children are supposed to act.

Settlement of conflict

The resolution of conflict assumes that one side has gained an advantage over the other, or that both sides gain something of advantage to them. The way in which conflict

is resolved may determine the course of future conflict situations.

Within the school, conflict was resolved by acceptance of sanctions, then all parties felt some satisfaction, or at least no major disatisfaction. Further, there was some legitimatizing of the norms of the school. If diplomacy was used, the rules were often abrogated for the sake of either unacceptability of a rule by a teacher, or else personal leniency on the part of the teacher or parent. Guerrilla warfare resulted when rules were broken, diplomacy failed, and no amount of compromise could be reached. What was reached was an acceptance of the likelihood of continued violations, of continued reporting, and of continued punishment until the student left school. More often than not, warfare was the major solution to solving conflicts. As neither side won these wars, they served as a reinforcing mechanism for the roles of each group involved.

## Implications for Teacher Education

If conflict is to be dealt with and understood, it must be looked at before it occurs. This analysis must, and should take place during the preparation of teachers. In this way, individuals may be prepared for their new roles. They may begin to understand why conflict occurs and attempt to solve conflict situation before it starts.

Course work and preparation will not change the occurrance of conflict, but it might alter sterotyped perceptions of it.

APPENDIX A - Non-Participant Behavior
Observation Information

TYPES OF CONFLICT OBSERVED

DURING NON-PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR RESEARCH

| Type of Conflict | Number of cases observed | |
|---|---|---|
| Unexcused absences and Excessive absences | 15 | 42.8% |
| Unauthorized use of tobacco | 10 | 28.5% |
| Unauthorized use of drugs | 5 | 14.2% |
| Unauthorized use of alcohol | 3 | 8.5% |
| Other Cheating and Pass forging | 2 | 5.7% |
| Total cases observed | 35 | |

UNEXCUSED ABSENCES BY SEX AND AGE
FROM NON-PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION

| AGE | NUMBER OF CASES OBSERVED | | MALE | % | FEMALE | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 3 | 20 % | 2 | 66% | 1 | 33% |
| 15 | 4 | 26.6% | 3 | 75% | 1 | 25% |
| 16 | 4 | 26.6% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% |
| 17 | 3 | 20 % | 1 | 33% | 2 | 66% |
| 18 | 1 | 7.6% | 1 | 100% | 0 | |
| TOTALS | 15 | 100 % | 9 | 60% | 6 | 40% |

DISCIPLINE PROCEDURES FOR UNAUTHORIZED USE OF TOBACCO, DRUGS, AND ALCOHOL

| | First Offense | Second Offense | Third or More Offenses |
|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher | x | x | x |
| Dean | x | x | x |
| Letter to Parents | x | | |
| In-school Suspension | x | | |
| Parental Conference | | x | x |
| 3 Day Out-School Suspension | | x | |
| Suspension | | | x |
| Executive Committee | | | x |
| Expulsion | | | possible |
| Return to Class | x | x | x |

x indicates levels of participation by school personel and type of disciplinary action for each offense

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF ALCOHOL BY SEX AND AGE
FROM NON-PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR OBSERVATIONS

| Age | Number of Cases Observed | | Male % | Female % |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| 15 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 2 | 66.67% | 2 66.67% | 0 |
| 17 | 1 | 33.33% | 1 33.33% | 0 |
| 18 | 0 | | 0 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 3 | 100 % | 100 % | |

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF TOBACCO BY SEX AND AGE

FROM NON-PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION

| Age | Number of Cases Observed | | Male | % | Female | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 2 | 20% | 1 | 50% | 1 | 50% |
| 15 | 4 | 40% | 1 | 25% | 3 | 75% |
| 16 | 4 | 40% | 2 | 50% | 2 | 50% |
| 17 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| 18 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| TOTAL | 10 | 100% | 4 | 40% | 6 | 60% |

UNAUTHORIZED USE OF DRUGS BY SEX AND AGE

FROM NON-PARTICIPANT BEHAVIOR OBSERVATION

| Age | Number of Cases Observed | | Male | % | Female | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 2 | 40% | 0 | | 2 | 100% |
| 15 | 1 | 20% | 1 | 100% | 0 | |
| 16 | 1 | 20% | 0 | | 1 | 100% |
| 17 | 1 | 20% | 1 | 100% | 0 | |
| 18 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| TOTALS | 5 | 100% | 2 | 40% | 3 | 60% |

# APPENDIX B

# INFORMATION

# GATHERED FROM STATISTICAL INSTRUMENT

Question: Have you ever broken a school rule?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 1<br>.7% | 91<br>61.1% | 57<br>38.3% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 5<br>2.2% | 174<br>75.3% | 52<br>22.5% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 1<br>1.0% | 72<br>69.9% | 30<br>29.1% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 7<br>1.4% | 337<br>69.8% | 139<br>28.8% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 12.04 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .017

Question: If you have broken a school rule, was it cutting a class?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 1<br>.7% | 67<br>45.0% | 81<br>54.4% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 1<br>.4% | 114<br>49.4% | 116<br>50.2% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 0<br>0% | 33<br>32.0% | 70<br>68.0% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 2<br>.4% | 214<br>44.3% | 267<br>55.3% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 9.60 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .048

Question: If you have broken a school rule, was it smoking in school?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 1<br>.7% | 26<br>17.4% | 122<br>81.9% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 1<br>.4% | 45<br>19.5% | 185<br>80.1% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 0<br>0% | 7<br>6.8% | 96<br>93.2% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 2<br>.4% | 78<br>16.1% | 403<br>83.4% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 9.5 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .049

Question: Do you know of anyone who has used drugs in school?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 1<br>.7% | 30<br>20.1% | 118<br>79.2% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 3<br>1.3% | 180<br>77.9% | 48<br>20.8% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 1<br>1.0% | 89<br>86.4% | 13<br>12.6% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 5<br>1.0% | 294<br>61.9% | 179<br>37.1% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 166.4 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .001

Question: Do you know of anyone who has been drunk in school?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 3<br>2.0% | 12<br>8.1% | 134<br>89.9% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 5<br>2.2% | 151<br>65.4% | 75<br>32.5% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 2<br>1.9% | 73<br>70.9% | 28<br>27.2% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 10<br>2.1% | 236<br>48.9% | 237<br>49.1% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 147.63 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .001

Question: Do you think that being drunk in school is acceptable behavior?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 10<br>6.7% | 2<br>1.3% | 137<br>91.9% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 23<br>10.0% | 52<br>22.5% | 156<br>67.5% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 0<br>0 % | 0<br>0 % | 103<br>100.0% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 33<br>6.8% | 54<br>11.2% | 396<br>82.0% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 73.05 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .001

Question: Do you think that using drugs in school is acceptable behavior?

| | No answer | Yes | No | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent | 7<br>4.7% | 5<br>3.4% | 137<br>91.9% | 149<br>30.8% |
| Student | 19<br>8.2% | 46<br>19.9% | 166<br>71.9% | 231<br>47.8% |
| Teacher | 0<br>0 % | 1<br>1.0% | 102<br>99.0% | 103<br>21.3% |
| Total | 26<br>5.4% | 52<br>10.8% | 405<br>83.9% | 483<br>100.0% |

Raw chi-square = 51.83 with 4 degrees of freedom.
Significance = .001

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barakat, Halim I. Alienation from the School System-Its Dynamics and Structure. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research. 1966.

Bohannan, Paul. "Culture, Aggression, and Where We Are Going," Social Education, Vol. 37, Number 7. November, 1973.

Corrigan, Dean and Golden, Garland. "Studying Role Relationships," Association for Student Teaching Research Bulletin, Number 6. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching. 1966.

Dubin, Robert. "Deviant Behaviors and Social Structure: Continuities in Social Theory," American Sociological Review, XXIV. April, 1959.

Getzels, J., and Guba, E. G. "The Structure of Roles and Role Conflict in the Teaching Situation," Journal of Educational Sociology, Vol. 29. Fall-Winter, 1955-56.

Graves, T., Jessor, R., Hanson, R., and Jessor, S. Society, Personality, and Deviant Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. 1968.

Hagstrom, Warren O. and Gardner, Leslie. Characteristics of Disruptive High School Students. Madison: Wisconsin University-Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning. September, 1969.

Hoy, Wayne K. An Investigation of the Relationships Between Characteristics of Secondary Schools and Student Alienation. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare). January, 1971.

Nye, Robert D. Conflict Among Humans. New York: The Springer Publishing Company. 1973.

Washburne, Chandler. "The Teacher in the Authority System," Journal of Educational Sociology XXX, Number 9. 1957.

Wienberg, Carl. Contexts of Teacher Alienation. Los Angeles: California University. January, 1968.

Wills, Vernon C. "A Practical Attempt at Humanizing Education," Contemporary Education. October, 1971.